

Seattle Social Development Project

Benefit-cost estimates updated June 2016. Literature review updated April 2012.

Current estimates replace old estimates. Numbers will change over time as a result of model inputs and monetization methods.

The WSIPP benefit-cost analysis examines, on an apples-to-apples basis, the monetary value of programs or policies to determine whether the benefits from the program exceed its costs. WSIPP's research approach to identifying evidence-based programs and policies has three main steps. First, we determine "what works" (and what does not work) to improve outcomes using a statistical technique called meta-analysis. Second, we calculate whether the benefits of a program exceed its costs. Third, we estimate the risk of investing in a program by testing the sensitivity of our results. For more detail on our methods, see our [Technical Documentation](#).

Program Description: The Seattle Social Development Project (SSDP) targets youth in 1st to 6th grades to increase bonding to school and family as a protective measure against school failure, delinquency, drug abuse, teen pregnancy, and violence. The SSDP is a school-based program with annual teacher training in communication, effective classroom management, and cooperative learning. The program also provides a curriculum focused on child skill development in communication, negotiation, conflict resolution, and refusal skills to students in 1st grade. Parents are trained in behavior management, academic support, and skills to reduce risks for drug use.

Benefit-Cost Summary Statistics Per Participant

Benefits to:

Taxpayers	\$5,096	Benefit to cost ratio	\$4.27
Participants	\$8,468	Benefits minus costs	\$12,148
Others	\$3,701	Chance the program will produce	
Indirect	(\$1,406)	benefits greater than the costs	66 %
<u>Total benefits</u>	<u>\$15,860</u>		
<u>Net program cost</u>	<u>(\$3,712)</u>		
Benefits minus cost	\$12,148		

The estimates shown are present value, life cycle benefits and costs. All dollars are expressed in the base year chosen for this analysis (2015). The chance the benefits exceed the costs are derived from a Monte Carlo risk analysis. The details on this, as well as the economic discount rates and other relevant parameters are described in our [Technical Documentation](#).

Detailed Monetary Benefit Estimates Per Participant

Benefits from changes to: ¹	Benefits to:				
	Participants	Taxpayers	Others ²	Indirect ³	Total
Crime	\$0	\$334	\$743	\$167	\$1,244
Labor market earnings associated with high school graduation	\$9,221	\$4,187	\$4,226	\$0	\$17,635
K-12 grade repetition	\$0	\$147	\$0	\$73	\$220
Public assistance	(\$1)	\$3	\$0	\$1	\$3
Health care associated with educational attainment	(\$274)	\$1,001	(\$1,094)	\$501	\$134
Costs of higher education	(\$498)	(\$589)	(\$186)	(\$294)	(\$1,567)
Subtotals	\$8,448	\$5,084	\$3,689	\$447	\$17,668
From secondary participant					
Labor market earnings associated with high school graduation	\$23	\$10	\$10	\$0	\$43
K-12 grade repetition	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Health care associated with educational attainment	(\$1)	\$2	\$2	\$1	\$5
Costs of higher education	(\$1)	(\$1)	\$0	\$0	(\$3)
Subtotals	\$21	\$12	\$12	\$1	\$46
Adjustment for deadweight cost of program	\$0	\$0	\$0	(\$1,855)	(\$1,855)
Totals	\$8,468	\$5,096	\$3,701	(\$1,406)	\$15,860

¹In addition to the outcomes measured in the meta-analysis table, WSIPP measures benefits and costs estimated from other outcomes associated with those reported in the evaluation literature. For example, empirical research demonstrates that high school graduation leads to reduced crime. These associated measures provide a more complete picture of the detailed costs and benefits of the program.

²"Others" includes benefits to people other than taxpayers and participants. Depending on the program, it could include reductions in crime victimization, the economic benefits from a more educated workforce, and the benefits from employer-paid health insurance.

³"Indirect benefits" includes estimates of the net changes in the value of a statistical life and net changes in the deadweight costs of taxation.


Detailed Annual Cost Estimates Per Participant

	Annual cost	Year dollars	Summary	
Program costs	\$499	1999	Present value of net program costs (in 2015 dollars)	(\$3,712)
Comparison costs	\$0	1999	Cost range (+ or -)	10 %

The full per-participant cost to deliver the program over six years is taken from Hawkins, J.D., Catalano, R.F., Kosterman, R., Abbott, R., & Hill, K.G. (1999). Preventing adolescent health-risk behaviors by strengthening protection during childhood. *Archives of Pediatrics & Adolescent Medicine*, 153(3), 226-234.

The figures shown are estimates of the costs to implement programs in Washington. The comparison group costs reflect either no treatment or treatment as usual, depending on how effect sizes were calculated in the meta-analysis. The cost range reported above reflects potential variation or uncertainty in the cost estimate; more detail can be found in our [Technical Documentation](#).

Detailed Annual Cost Estimates Per Participant



The graph above illustrates the estimated cumulative net benefits per-participant for the first fifty years beyond the initial investment in the program. We present these cash flows in non-discounted dollars to simplify the “break-even” point from a budgeting perspective. If the dollars are negative (bars below \$0 line), the cumulative benefits do not outweigh the cost of the program up to that point in time. The program breaks even when the dollars reach \$0. At this point, the total benefits to participants, taxpayers, and others, are equal to the cost of the program. If the dollars are above \$0, the benefits of the program exceed the initial investment.

Meta-Analysis of Program Effects

Outcomes measured	Primary or secondary participant	No. of effect sizes	Treatment N	Adjusted effect sizes and standard errors used in the benefit-cost analysis						Unadjusted effect size (random effects model)	
				First time ES is estimated			Second time ES is estimated				
				ES	SE	Age	ES	SE	Age	ES	p-value
Crime	Primary	1	149	-0.081	0.154	19	-0.081	0.154	29	-0.214	0.182
High school graduation	Primary	1	149	0.097	0.152	19	0.097	0.152	19	-0.255	0.109
K-12 grade repetition	Primary	1	149	-0.135	0.161	16	-0.135	0.161	17	-0.355	0.042
Teen pregnancy (under age 18)	Primary	1	149	-0.127	0.153	19	-0.127	0.153	29	-0.335	0.040
Initiation of sexual activity	Primary	1	149	-0.146	0.166	19	-0.146	0.166	29	-0.385	0.015
Teen births under age 18	Primary	1	149	-0.114	0.192	19	-0.114	0.192	29	-0.300	0.148
Teen births (second generation)	Secondary	1	149	-0.114	0.192	19	-0.114	0.192	29	-0.300	0.148
Alcohol use in high school	Primary	1	149	-0.011	0.146	19	-0.011	0.146	19	-0.030	0.836

Meta-analysis is a statistical method to combine the results from separate studies on a program, policy, or topic in order to estimate its effect on an outcome. WSIPP systematically evaluates all credible evaluations we can locate on each topic. The outcomes measured are the types of program impacts that were measured in the research literature (for example, crime or educational attainment). Treatment N represents the total number of individuals or units in the treatment group across the included studies.

An effect size (ES) is a standard metric that summarizes the degree to which a program or policy affects a measured outcome. If the effect size is positive, the outcome increases. If the effect size is negative, the outcome decreases.

Adjusted effect sizes are used to calculate the benefits from our benefit cost model. WSIPP may adjust effect sizes based on methodological characteristics of the study. For example, we may adjust effect sizes when a study has a weak research design or when the program developer is involved in the research. The magnitude of these adjustments varies depending on the topic area.

WSIPP may also adjust the second ES measurement. Research shows the magnitude of some effect sizes decrease over time. For those effect sizes, we estimate outcome-based adjustments which we apply between the first time ES is estimated and the second time ES is estimated. We also report the unadjusted effect size to show the effect sizes before any adjustments have been made. More details about these adjustments can be found in our [Technical Documentation](#).

Citations Used in the Meta-Analysis

- Hawkins, J.D., Catalano, R.F., Kosterman, R., Abbott, R., & Hill, K.G. (1999). Preventing adolescent health-risk behaviors by strengthening protection during childhood. *Archives of Pediatrics & Adolescent Medicine*, 153(3), 226-234.
- Hawkins, J.D., Kosterman, R., Catalano, R.F., Hill, K.G., & Abbott, R.D. (2005). Promoting positive adult functioning through social development intervention in childhood: Long-term effects from the Seattle Social Development Project. *Archives of Pediatrics & Adolescent Medicine*, 159(1), 25-31.

For further information, contact:
(360) 664-9800, institute@wsipp.wa.gov

Printed on 12-21-2016



Washington State Institute for Public Policy

The Washington State Legislature created the Washington State Institute for Public Policy in 1983. A Board of Directors-representing the legislature, the governor, and public universities-governs WSIPP and guides the development of all activities. WSIPP's mission is to carry out practical research, at legislative direction, on issues of importance to Washington State.